

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application in view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-7 are now present in this application, wherein claims 5-7 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 5-7 are independent.

In the present Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 have been amended.

No new matter has been added with the present amendments. For instance, regarding claim 3, Applicants note the specification at page 3, lines 29-31. Otherwise, the amendments are clarifying in nature and not narrowing in scope. By deleting/amending these terms in order to clarify the claimed invention (e.g., deletion of “general” before “formula II”), Applicants in no way are conceding any limitations with respect to the interpretation of the claims under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Based upon the above considerations, entry of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the only rejection and allow the currently pending claims.

**Information Disclosure Citation**

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed March 16, 2006 and December 3, 2009, and for providing Applicants with initialed copies of the PTO-SB08 forms filed therewith.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, as stated in subparagraphs **a.-c.** on page 4 of the Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding subparagraph **a.** of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully refer the Examiner to the claims as shown herein. The term “general” has been deleted.

Regarding subparagraph **b.** of the Office Action, the phrase “either a) or b):” has been added for clarification.

Regarding subparagraph **c.** of the Office Action, Applicants have deleted “derivative” from the claim.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

**Rejoinder**

Applicants note paragraph **2** of the Office Action. It is believed that claims 1-4 are in condition for allowance. Thus, rejoinder of withdrawn claims 5-7 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Eugene T. Perez, Registration No. 48501 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: JUN 7 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Gerald M. Murphy, Jr.  
Registration No.: 28977  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
703-205-8000